From: Lenée Bilski <leneebilski@hotmail.com>
Sent time: 09/20/2018 01:58:52 PM
To: Doug Willmore
Subject: VTTM Tract 50666 Lot D

I used the wrong address on Cc below and it was returned "undeliverable ".

From: Lenée Bilski <leneebilski@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2018 1:51 PM
To: So Kim
Cc: Doug.Willmore@rpvca.gov; Ara M.
Subject: Fw: VTTM Tract 50666 Lot D

Sept. 20, 2018

Hi So,
The designation of Lot D is a problem for some residents of the Portuguese Bend Club (PBC). Kelvin Vanderlip, who has not lived here during the decades of negotiations, lawsuits and mitigation measures regarding the Zuckerman/Trump property, has the idea that it should be or is a "park". He is trying to be helpful, but seems to be creating issues.
My understanding is that since Lot D extends from the PBC to the Driving Range, there are public trails (for humans) included - Very specific trails mapped out long ago - with some public access, and a fire-buffer area which is only for approved plant species, Not for human recreational use of that area of Lot D . No private trails, no private/community gates. Public trails must be a minimun of 32 ft. away from the PBC property line. That's where public access begins, on the trails. That's my understanding. Am I correct?

It seems some PBC members would like to see the fire-buffer area of Lot D as a "park" where they could walk and perhaps let their dogs run loose. See Kelvin V.'s email below. That is not what that area of Lot D is designated to be. Sierra Club attorney Frank Angel stated the issue well at a previous CC mtg.

However, your recent reference using the word "park" (in 8/28 email to Kelvin below) seemed to energize Mr. Vanderlip to push for his community to challenge the proposed Landscaping Plan for Lot D to open it up according to their definition of a "park". Where did that term come from? Where in the documents is that term (open park space) used and since when? A Condition of Approval? or a Mitigation Measure?

"Lot D is intended to be open park space with public access with a specific plant palate." (email sent 8/28 from So Kim copied below)

Thanks in advance for your response with the information.

Lenée Bilski
Concerned resident
310-377-2645

From: Kelvin Vanderlip <kelvin@vanderlip.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 4, 2018 4:32 PM
To: Lenée Bilski
Subject: Re: VTTM Tract 50666 Lot D: Support for our opposition to the Community Planning Department's plans for Lot D

Hi Lenée,
Actually, this is a great site for a park. No one seems to want a park, but I do.
Best, Kel

(Composed on my cell phone)

On Sep 4, 2018 16:15, Lenée Bilski <leneebilski@hotmail.com> wrote:
> Hi Kelvin,

Thank you for your message about Trump Lot D.
I believe you are mistaken. Lot D is a Fire Buffer area and is restricted to a specific fire-resistant plant palette (and public trails as shown on the Public Amenities Plan). It should be planted, not barren soil. Plantings will discourage the general public from coming near the PBC properties. Have you thought of that? Don't you want privacy and security for those properties?
Sorry about your "community gate" but it's time for it to go. Members of PBC have used that access while the project remained undeveloped since the 1990's. You only have to walk a few extra feet up to PV Dr. South and take the California Coastal Trail that your community improved to get to the public trails on the Trump property. That shouldn't be such a hardship for you, your neighbors and your guests that have been using the cul de sac gate!

Mr. Posner confirmed what I understand stating " it may be problematic to provide access to the park from adjacent private properties. " Also there was a lawsuit about land use between the developer and the Sierra Club which was settled in the Sierra Club's favor. Were you told of that by PBC members? You really need to get the facts straight before you start trying to interject your suppositions here. Those of us who have lived here a long time have dealt with the Zuckermans and the Trump organization for decades regarding this project, whereas you have just recently returned to the area.
Remember: the public trails must be 32 ft. away from the PBC property lines.

Would you be okay with members of the general public trying to use that gate once the trails are built? I don't think so, but that's what will happen, Kelvin. That gate would be an invitation to walk down and check it out (or climb over it). Just use the improved path along PV Dr. So. for your walks and don't complain about the plantings up to the property line on Lot D. They will be fire resistant. That cannot be said for the Eucalyptus tree, bouganvillea, plumbago and other plants that are growing over the PBC fences and walls into Lot D space. Be grateful that the city is limiting the height as well as the species on Lot D to protect the views of the adjacent property owners.

Best regards,

LENÉE BILSKI

-

-------- Forwarded Message --------
Subject:FW: Trump LA - Lot D
Date: Tue, 28 Aug 2018 22:20:24 +0000
From:So Kim <SoK@rpvca.gov>
To:chuck.posner@coastal.ca.gov <chuck.posner@coastal.ca.gov>, kelvin@vanderlip.org <kelvin@vanderlip.org>
CC: Doug Willmore <DWillmore@rpvca.gov>, Ara Mihranian <AraM@rpvca.gov>, 'Zach Rehm (zach.rehm@coastal.ca.gov)' <zach.rehm@coastal.ca.gov>, CC <CC@rpvca.gov>

Dear Chuck and Kelvin,
This email is to clarify the issue of whether or not a pedestrian path solely to provide access from a private community over Lot D can be allowed. Lot D will be dedicated to the City for public open space with improved public trails based on the Council-approved Public Amenities Plan. At no time, since the original approvals were obtained by the City Council in 1992 and the Coastal Commission in 1993, did the Public Amenities Plan contemplate a trail that would connect Lot D to the Portuguese Bend Club community (PBC). **Lot D is intended to be open park space with public access with a specific plant palate.** Additionally, Zach Rehm (Coastal Commission Staff assigned to the Trump Project) reviewed the landscape plan and confirmed that Coastal Commission did not approve the trail from PBC to Lot D (see highlighted text in the email below). He is also correct in that the requested trail from PBC to Lot D would not be in compliance with City-imposed condition requiring a 32' minimum setback from the PBC property line to any trail. When the Director and I met with Mr. Kelvin and Mr. Gakenheimer a week ago, we let them know that the PBC may work with the Public Works Dept to create a shortcut immediately adjacent to the gate that would connect to the public trail on PVDS. Doing so would not cross over into Lot D.
As for landscaping, Lot D is considered a Fire Buffer/fire break. As a result, there was a specific Fire Buffer Zone Plant

Palette approved by the Coastal Commission. There are specific plants allowed on lot D, which are fire resistant and drought tolerant.
I hope this helps clarify the matter regarding the pedestrian path as well as the type of landscaping allowed for Lot D. Also, as a reminder, the City Council approved condition allows the Director to review and approve the Landscape Plan for Lot D, provided that it meets the Council-approved conditions of approval. The Landscape Plan is not subject to a public hearing with the City Council.
Sincerely,
So Kim, AICP
Deputy Director/Planning Manager
Community Development Department
City of Rancho Palos Verdes
www.rpvca.gov
(310) 544-5222

From: "Posner, Chuck@Coastal" <Chuck.Posner@coastal.ca.gov>
Date: August 28, 2018 at 10:54:10 AM PDT
To: "'kelvin@vanderlip.org'" <kelvin@vanderlip.org>
Cc: Susan Brooks <susan.brooks@rpvca.gov>, "Rehm, Zach@Coastal" <Zach.Rehm@coastal.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: Request for meeting regarding the use of Lot D, VTTM 50666, Rancho Palos Verdes

Mr. Vanderlip – To confirm what we discussed this morning: Lot D does appear to be designated as a park, although there may exist some habitat value that will have to be preserved when the formal walkways and bike paths are installed and when the area is landscaped with native plants. I agree that the area adjacent to the homes should be considered defensible space when the landscaping plan is developed, meaning that plant species should be used that reduce any fire hazard and the plan should include a fuel modification component that allows the area near habitable structures to be selectively thinned in order to reduce fire hazard. Also, we will discuss with the City any issues it may have with the park's access from the adjacent neighborhood. I don't know any reason why an existing public accessway would be closed. However, it may be problematic to provide access to the park from adjacent private properties. Please keep in mind, however, that Zach is much more familiar with the details of the amended permit than am I. therefore, I recommend that we consult with him on these issues as soon as he is back in the office (probably Sept. 5). In any case, I can confirm that there is no proposal to change to the conditions of the amended coastal development permit as they currently exist. At this time our staff is working with the permittee and City to comply with the conditions of the amended coastal development permit.

Charles R. Posner
Supervisor of Planning
California Coastal Commission
200 Oceangate - Tenth Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
(562) 590-5071
Chuck.posner@coastal.ca.gov

From: Rehm, Zach@Coastal [mailto:Zach.Rehm@coastal.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2018 5:22 PM
To: Jill Martin <jmartin@trumpnational.com>; So Kim <SoK@rpvca.gov>; Steve Wood (swood@lrmltd.com) <swood@lrmltd.com>
Subject: RE: Trump LA - Lot D

Thank you, Jill. I have two comments:

1. The revegetation plan for the area at the southwest portion of Lot D (left side of page 2) is still unclear. I see an approximation of my triangle has been added, with what appears to be ash buckwheat proposed. But I don't understand the two circles and the thin squiggly line. If the squiggly line is the existing chain link fence, then please just eliminate the triangle and propose ash buckwheat with temporary irrigation in the entire area northeast of the squiggly line (capturing the smaller triangle and the bigger triangle). Southwest of the fence, existing vegetation may remain and new irrigation should not be installed.
2. Please remove the trail connecting to the Portuguese Bend cul-du-sac depicted on page 3. I'm not sure why that appeared on the most recent draft, but the Coastal Commission has not approved any trails in that portion of Lot D

which is designated for habitat/fire break - and any development within 32 feet of the Portuguese Bend tract is prohibited by the City permit. Additionally I received a call from a Sierra Club attorney asserting that gates and use trails from the Portuguese Bend property are prohibited by the Ocean Trails/CCC/RPV settlement agreement. If the Portuguese Bend HOA desires a new access point from their cul-du-sac, they can construct a path or stairway to connect to PV Drive South adjacent to the coral tree at their own expense.

--

Zach Rehm
Senior Transportation Program Analyst
California Coastal Commission
200 Oceangate, 10th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
(562) 590-5071